

early all members who spoke said they had known Governor Hayes from boyhood, and who had always felt that he was destined to be a great man some day.

PARKER TO THE FRONT.

PREDICTION THAT HE WILL CARRY JERSEY AND PENNSYLVANIA.

If Joel Parker does not receive the nomination for the Presidency at the St. Louis Convention it will not be from any lack of enthusiasm or earnest effort on the part of Jerseymen. A large number of prominent Jersey politicians assembled yesterday at the Merchants' Hotel, in Cortlandt street, as it was announced that ex-Governor Parker would be in attendance, but he did not make his appearance. Mr. Wolbert, chairman of the Parker Committee, said to a Herald reporter: "The prospect could not be better. Parker goes into the Convention at St. Louis stronger than Hayes did at Cincinnati. You seem incredulous; but ask the leading politicians of Pennsylvania of both parties, and they will bear me out. See, there is one opposite; speak to him. The senator, Jacobus, of New York, who is alluded to by Judge Waller, of Honduras, who was the chairman of the Republican Executive Committee of Wayne county during the two campaigns of Gerrit for the gubernatorial election. When asked what were his views on the Parker movement he replied, 'I can't speak for other States, but I feel certain that Parker is the only democrat that can carry Pennsylvania. We go back on Hayes, and he goes back on us. When we were in a tight place, as we are now, the success of our ticket, I hope Parker may not be pitted against him.'"

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PENNSYLVANIA AGAINST ANOTHER WAR TICKET. Mr. Dimmick, another republican of Philadelphia, observed during the course of a discussion with Judge Waller, of Honduras, who was the chairman of the Republican Executive Committee of Wayne county during the two campaigns of Gerrit for the gubernatorial election. When asked what were his views on the Parker movement he replied, 'I can't speak for other States, but I feel certain that Parker is the only democrat that can carry Pennsylvania. We go back on Hayes, and he goes back on us. When we were in a tight place, as we are now, the success of our ticket, I hope Parker may not be pitted against him.'"

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PENNSYLVANIA AGAINST ANOTHER WAR TICKET. Mr. Dimmick, another republican of Philadelphia, observed during the course of a discussion with Judge Waller, of Honduras, who was the chairman of the Republican Executive Committee of Wayne county during the two campaigns of Gerrit for the gubernatorial election. When asked what were his views on the Parker movement he replied, 'I can't speak for other States, but I feel certain that Parker is the only democrat that can carry Pennsylvania. We go back on Hayes, and he goes back on us. When we were in a tight place, as we are now, the success of our ticket, I hope Parker may not be pitted against him.'"

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PENNSYLVANIA AGAINST ANOTHER WAR TICKET. Mr. Dimmick, another republican of Philadelphia, observed during the course of a discussion with Judge Waller, of Honduras, who was the chairman of the Republican Executive Committee of Wayne county during the two campaigns of Gerrit for the gubernatorial election. When asked what were his views on the Parker movement he replied, 'I can't speak for other States, but I feel certain that Parker is the only democrat that can carry Pennsylvania. We go back on Hayes, and he goes back on us. When we were in a tight place, as we are now, the success of our ticket, I hope Parker may not be pitted against him.'"

MAINE REPUBLICANS.

RANDOLPH, June 21, 1876. The Republican State Convention meets here tomorrow. It will be a merely formal affair. Nothing of particular interest is expected to occur.

The Fourth Congressional District Convention also will be a mere formality. The Hon. John A. Andrew, of Boston, is the only prominent candidate, and it is thought will receive the nomination over H. M. Planted, the present incumbent.

SOLDIERS' NATIONAL REUNION.

COLUMBUS, Ohio, June 21, 1876. Great preparations are being made for the third annual reunion of soldiers of the Civil War, to be held here on September 5, 6 and 7. The War Department, under resolution of Congress, will furnish the camp with canvas and muskets. A sham battle will be one of the most interesting features of the occasion.

PARDONS BY THE GOVERNOR.

ALBANY, June 21, 1876. The Governor has pardoned Samuel Adams, sentenced in New York county, April 1, 1874, to three years imprisonment in Sing Sing for receiving stolen goods. Judge Sutherland and Assistant District Attorney Rollins give good reasons why the pardon should be issued.

The Governor has granted a commutation to Charles Brabender, sentenced in New York, September 30, 1871, to twenty years imprisonment in Sing Sing, transferred to Clinton, for rape. The sentence is commuted to seven years, and the prisoner is to be released on the legal deductions for good conduct. The recommendations in this case are numerous. The prosecuting officers are satisfied that the offense was greatly extenuated upon the facts of the case, and that a large reduction in the length of the sentence.

CENTRAL AMERICA.

PANAMA, June 12, 1876. There are no new developments in the war attitude between Costa Rica and Nicaragua. The pressure of the anti-slavery policy, now predominant in all the Central American States save Nicaragua, is likely to change her policy and prevent a war with Costa Rica on the boundary question, which is ostensibly the first, but in reality only a secondary, cause of the disagreement.

FATAL ACCIDENT TO GERMAN SAILORS.

The captain, first officer and two men of the German steamer "Gotha," of the German navy, were killed at May, Greytown, while taking a boatload of sail from the beach to the vessel. They were with the crew's throw of the brig when the boat was swamped. The crew were rescued by the brig, but the boat, with some of the crew, was lost. The cause of the accident was the boat's being too low in the water, and the crew's not being able to assist the boat's crew in its distress.

THE INTER-OCEANIC CANAL QUESTION.

The inter-oceanic canal fever, both in Nicaragua and Colombia, is gaining in intensity.

ORANGE COUNTY LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

MIDDLETOWN, N. Y., June 21, 1876. Oliver Cotter, of Brooklyn, and Detective Officer Lane appeared before the Grand Jury in the Court of the City and County of New York, yesterday and to-day, against sixty-two Newburg and eight Middletown liquor dealers, but the Grand Jury refused to indict the accused. Cotter and Lane spent the last two Sundays in visiting the Middletown saloons, and the Grand Jury refused to indict the accused. Cotter and Lane spent the last two Sundays in visiting the Middletown saloons, and the Grand Jury refused to indict the accused.

MURDER.

CINCINNATI, Ohio, June 21, 1876. At Oxford, Ohio, last night a man named Camfield threw a brick at one Davis, his brother-in-law, while the latter was endeavoring to protect his sister, Camfield's wife, from abuse. Davis immediately shot him, from the effect of which he died in a few hours. Davis was arrested.

MURDERED FOR HIS MONEY.

QUINCY, Ill., June 21, 1876. The body found floating in the river yesterday has been identified as that of M. Buss, of St. Thomas. An investigation shows that he was murdered on the wharf adjoining Fidelity market, and the body thrown into the river. A sum of money which he is known to have had on his person is missing.

FATAL ASSAULT BY A WOMAN.

BOSTON, Mass., June 21, 1876. A man named Zeelig was found in a saloon in the Highland district last night in a dying condition, and a woman named Kate had been arrested on a charge of making his wounds.

SENTENCE OF A MURDERER.

PONT JERVIS, N. Y., June 21, 1876. Henry Moon, who drove the child in the west wagon of the Delaware River at Wilton, Delaware recently last spring, was found guilty of the last term of the court at Delhi, and sentenced to seven years in the State Prison at Auburn.

CONGRESS.

Active Work by Both Houses on the Appropriation Bills.

THE FREEDMAN'S BANK SWINDLE.

Debate on the Proposed Transfer of the Indian Bureau.

A WESTERN SENATOR ON THE PEACE POLICY.

Action of the House on the Sunday Civil Appropriation Bill.

SENATE.

WASHINGTON, June 21, 1876.

The CHAIRMAN laid before the Senate a message from the President in regard to the case of Winslow, which was read in the Senate Chamber yesterday.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), submitted a resolution instructing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to inquire into laws, if any, necessary to protect the inviolability of private dispatches sent by magnetic telegraph, and what legislation is necessary to prevent the seizure of such dispatches by unauthorized or irresponsible persons, and report by bill or otherwise. Agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN called up the House joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to issue \$10,000,000 in silver coin in exchange for legal tender notes, the notes so redeemed to be kept as a separate fund and released only on the retirement and destruction of a like amount of fractional currency received by the government for dues. He submitted an amendment providing that the trade dollar shall not hereafter be a legal tender, and authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to limit the coinage thereof to such amount as he may deem sufficient to meet the export demand for the same.

Mr. SARGENT, (rep. of Cal.), said the trade dollar was at a greater discount in California than the ordinary subsidiary silver coin. The trade dollar was worth but ninety cents for gold, while the subsidiary silver coin was worth ninety-four and ninety-five cents. There was a general protest in his section against this trade dollar.

The amendment of Mr. Sherman was agreed to. Mr. SHERMAN said he thought \$20,000,000 in silver coin should be issued instead of \$10,000,000, though he did not want to endanger the passage of the bill by offering that amendment if it would cause debate. If the Senate should unanimously pass such amendment he had no doubt the House would agree to strike out the \$10,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$20,000,000.

Mr. SARGENT objected, and Mr. SHERMAN withdrew the amendment. In doing so he said he had no doubt the Senate from California would regret having passed the bill, and that he would not have done so if he had known of the amendment. It would be a mistake for Congress to adjourn this session without providing for the demand for small change.

Mr. SARGENT said if the amount should be increased to \$20,000,000 the result would be that an enormous amount of silver coin would be sent to the Pacific coast and would draw out all other currency.

Mr. MORTON said he would not oppose the bill, but he had grave doubts as to the wisdom of the trade dollar, which was worth only eighty-four cents on the dollar, and which he looked like saying to the world, "Our greenbacks are worth only eighty-four cents, and we are going to redeem them with silver."

The joint resolution was then passed. The Senate then, at a quarter to one P. M., on motion of Mr. SHERMAN, resumed the consideration of the bill to transfer the Indian Bureau to the War Department, and the House bill to transfer the Indian Bureau to the War Department.

When the doors were opened the Senate resumed the consideration of the unfinished business, being the Indian Appropriation bill, and Mr. SHERMAN withdrew the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations to strike out the third section of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the third section of the House bill, and the House bill to transfer the Indian Bureau to the War Department.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Minn.), moved that debate on all bills be limited to five minutes for each Senator desiring to speak on any amendment. Rejected.

REMARKS OF MR. MORTON. Mr. MORTON, of Indiana, said he was opposed to the transfer. In the first place, it was general legislation on an appropriation bill, and it was not proper to have general legislation on an appropriation bill. The whole civil service of the government could be changed by such bills. The whole civil service of the government could be changed by such bills. The whole civil service of the government could be changed by such bills.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs. He argued that this question should not be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

had been guarded by the army there would have been no difficulty.

Mr. MORTON denied that the peace policy had any effect on the Indian Bureau. He said that the President did issue his proclamation notifying intruders to keep out of the Black Hills.

Mr. INGALLS in explanation of his remark as to the peace policy said he meant to say that he only spoke of the Quakers as representative men opposed to military power. It was for the Indians respected and the peace policy was for the benefit of the Indians.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), argued that Congress was bound to make appropriations for the Indians in the future. He said that the time was when \$3,000,000 of red men hunted over the hills and mountains of the country. They wanted it, and the white men were the invaders. All the discussion about the transfer of the Indian Bureau should not be upon an appropriation bill; it was trading with the public business.

Treaty stipulations the humanity, justice and common decency demanded that the appropriations for these Indians should be made. He opposed the transfer of the Indian Bureau to the War Department, and he had no right to devote this duty upon the army. The men who enlisted to carry the flag of the country and defend its territory were not to be used to carry the flag of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. STEVENSON, (dem. of Ky.), said if the motion of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Ingalls) should be voted down, he thought it would be better to have the bill and leave out the clause in regard to the transfer of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

amendment of the Senate, which provides that the silver trade dollar shall not be a legal tender. He said that under no circumstances would he consent to any amendment of the bill.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill was not a peace policy, but a military policy. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it. He said that the bill was a military policy, and he was not in favor of it.

Mr. MORTON, (rep. of Ind.), said it was plain that this bill